

## REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated December 13, 2006. A request for a one (1) month extension of time and the associated fee has been included in this Response.

Claims 1, 6, 14 and 15 are currently amended in the Application

Claims 1-21 are pending in the Application.

### I. Claim Objections

Claim 6 stands objected for improper dependency.

Claim 6 has been amended to overcome this objection.

Applicant believes no new matter has been added. Reconsideration of Amended Claim 6 is respectfully requested.

### II. Claim Rejections, 35 USC §102

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being unpatentable over *Swartz* US Patent Publication 2003/0020629 A1, hereinafter *Swartz*.

*Swartz* teaches a wearable computer for data communication. The wearable system includes an optical scanner or imager, like applicant's system. (See Page 1, paragraph 002]

*Swartz* teaches all the features of applicant's invention EXCEPT:

*Swartz* does not teach using a text-to-speech software application for the networked computer to speak to a user or wearer of the device in combination with a trainable voice recognition software application that is trainable in combination with the text-to-speech software while using two way visual communication with the wearer or the user.

Applicant's invention is usable in the dark, or in a darkened warehouse because of the two simultaneous bidirectional communications, which include simultaneous communication via a display and the audio text-to-speech communication.

Applicant's invention is faster to use because of the two types of communication being enabled at the same time and safer by providing a hands free order filling from the wearable mobile computer. In contrast, *Swartz* uses a server that communicates with the wearable mobile computer. Specifically, *Swartz* states "a software on the server performs voice recognition ... The server software converts the spoken words into an address and pass the information back to the phone." [See *Swartz* Paragraph [0094]].

Applicant's invention provides reliability and efficiency by having the text-to-speech software and voice recognition software stored on the wearable mobile computer. For example, as stated in the interview of March 20, 2007, the stacking of toilet paper from the floor to the ceiling in a warehouse would prevent the mobile computer from communicating with the server.

Applicant's invention enables verification of the objects being selected through voice recognition software, stored on the wearable mobile computer, and confirmation by text-to-speech software, stored on the wearable mobile computer, for more versatility than inventions that only have pre-programmed responses, that are not interactive with the user.

Although *Swartz* does discuss that the user can communicate to the system with the headset with the microphone and speaker, it does not suggest using these two types of

software applications stored on a wearable mobile computer. As stated above *Swartz* teaches storing the voice recognition software on a server.

Reconsideration of this Application with the amended claims in view of the remarks expressed throughout this Response is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: MARCH 23, 2007

/WBUSKOP/

Wendy K. Buskop  
Patent Attorney  
Reg. No. 32,202

Please mail correspondence to:

The address associated with **customer number 29637**.

Wendy K.B. Buskop  
Buskop Law Group, P.C.  
1776 Yorktown, Suite 550  
Houston, Texas 77056  
713.275.3400